

70

REPORT ON 1972 RELEASEES TO PAROLE SUPERVISION
FROM MASSACHUSETTS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

Part I: Parole Management Data

Massachusetts Parole Board

Paul A. Chernoff
Chairman

April, 1973

Produced By:

Parole-Correction Information System
(Report prepared by Marian Hyler
and Carroll Miller)

A. INTRODUCTION

This report presents certain basic summary information on M.C.I. commitments released to parole supervision during 1972. The report describes (1) the number of such releases (by releasing institution, by type of parole), (2) areas paroled to, (3) release conditions, and (4) behavioral release conditions. Release conditions and behavioral release conditions are examined in considerable detail.

Two companion reports will also describe M.C.I. commitments released to parole supervision during 1972. The first focus is on Parole-relevant periods of time -- e.g. time to serve on parole before discharge, time in institution over reserve date, time incarcerated before release. The second describes characteristics known upon admission to prison -- e.g. offense, sentence, age, race, marital status, prior commitments.

This is the first major Parole report of the Parole-Correction Information System Project, which with L.E.A.A. funds has for the last year been working on the development of a computerized management information system for the Department of Correction and Parole Board. Its purpose is to produce reports such as the present one and to rapidly respond to the information requests of policy makers, program planners and other staff. The development of the information system has involved the collection of data concerning residents/parolees at the points of admission to prison and to parole, the design of a computer system to use this data to produce computerized files of data on current inmates and parolees, and the writing of programs to analyze this data. At present we have a data base consisting of forty variables describing M.C.I. inmates incarcerated at the beginning of 1973, and fifty-five variables describing M.C.I. commitments released to parole during 1973. This information system is designed to be tied into data on revocations (maintained by Lois Greenfield)

and data on recidivism (UPR data) and will expand in scope during 1973 as directed by agency needs. Any questions should be directed to Marian Hyler, the Parole representative on the project staff.

B. NUMBERS OF STATE PAROLE RELEASEES, TYPE OF PAROLE RELEASE, INSTITUTION RELEASED FROM

During calendar 1972 a total of 1366 men and women were released to parole supervision from Massachusetts Correctional Institutions. Twenty-six of these persons were released more than once during the year. This constitutes an increase over the number of state parolees in previous years. Table I presents the numbers of state releases to parole over the last six years.

TABLE I

State Parole Releases by Year, 1967-1972*

	<u>N</u>
1967	775
1968	759
1969	735
1970	759
1971	949
1972	1366

The number of new state case openings was fairly stable from 1967 to 1970, at between 735 and 775. However, 1971 saw a 25% increase (from 759 to 949), and 1972 saw a further 44% increase (from 949 to 1366).

*Except for 1972, these figures were taken from the Annual Statistical Reports of the Commissioner of Correction. (see Table 15, Statistics on Movement of Population)

During the last two years there has been a 77% increase in the yearly number of new state case openings (from 773 to 1366). Not included in these figures are the large numbers of House of Correction parole releasees. This increased burden on parole facilities was not accompanied by an increase in parole staff.

The majority of the new state parolees during 1972 were released from Concord. Table 2 presents the numbers of state parolees released from various institutions.

TABLE 2

INSTITUTION RELEASED FROM

	<u>N</u>	<u>%*</u>
Concord	694	(52%)
Norfolk	271	(20%)
Walpole	158	(12%)
Forestry Camps	95	(7%)
Framingham	89	(7%)
Boston State and Shirley	6	(0.4%)
Bridgewater	6	(0.4%)
Other (includes H.C. and outside of Mass.)	7	(0.5%)
Unknown	<u>40</u>	<u>—</u>
TOTAL	1366	

*The percentages in this table, as in other tables below, refer to percentages of the "knowns", not of the total.

Table 3 presents the type of parole release by the Board. 97% of the state paroles were to the community and 3% were to various forms of custody.

TABLE 3

Type of Parole Release

To Community	1331
To Custody	35
Other State's Authority	(4)
Federal Authorities	(5)
"B" Sentence	(6)
"C" Sentence	(1)
From and After at M.C.I.	(8)
From and After at H.C.	(6)
Massachusetts Warrant	(5)
 TOTAL	 1366

C. LOCALE ON RELEASE

Perhaps the variable of most widespread interest is the address on release of parole clients. This data is useful in planning release programs, contracting for services for parolees, and planning caseload and district re-assessments. Table 4 describes the numbers of state parolees released to various areas.* (Parole districts, which refer to parole officers, are grouped into "areas.")**

* As was noted in a Project memo (3-22-73), the city of Boston accounts for the first address on release of over one-quarter of state parolees. This figure does not include the 15% who are released to residential centers, most of which are located in Boston. Other large Massachusetts cities -- Springfield, Worcester, New Bedford, Fall River, Lynn, Lawrence -- together account for an additional 17%.

** Data on the first parole officer to which assigned was unavailable for 16 Framingham parolees. Of the 89 Framingham parolees, 73 are placed in the "Female" category and 16 in the "Unknown" category.

TABLE 4

Parole Districts Released To

<u>Areas (Parole districts)</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>N</u> <u>%*</u>
Central-Roxbury (22-31, 1A, 3A)	488 (39%)
North of Boston (1-9)	250 (20%)
Bridgewater Office (10-14)	153 (12%)
Worcester Office (16-21)	196 (16%)
Female	73 (6%)
Out-of-State	86 (7%)
Unknown	120 ----
TOTAL	1366

The Boston area, i.e. districts 22-31 plus special services, accounted for 39% of new state case openings in 1972. The northern suburbs and cities north of Boston (plus E. Boston & Charlestown) accounted for the next highest number of state case openings (20%), followed by the the Worcester Office with 16% and the Bridgewater with 12%. Female parolees and parolees assigned to out-of-state supervision together made up 13% of state case openings; these two groups of course constitute a smaller proportion of House of Correction parolees. Finally, a sizable proportion of parolees (15%) were released to residential programs. Brooke House and Project Overcome together accounted for 104 of the 199 state residential placements during 1972. The reader

* Again, as with all tables in this report where some data is unknown, the percentages refer to percentages of the "knowns," not of the total.

should refer to Appendix A for a more detailed table of release address.*

Table 5 presents case openings in the Central-Roxbury area in greater detail. (The percentages are proportions of the total state parolees, not of the Boston parolees.)

TABLE 5

Parole Districts of the Boston Area Released To

<u>Areas (parole districts)</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>	
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Roxbury-South End (26-30)	153	(12%)
Dorchester, W. Roxbury, Jamaica Plain (24, 25, 31)	118	(9%)
West End, North End, S. Boston (22, 23)	48	(4%)
Special Services + Overcome (3 Officers)	<u>169</u>	<u>(14%)</u>
TOTAL BOSTON MALE	488	(39%)

One implication of these tables is that the Special Services and Overcome parole officers averaged considerably more state case openings during 1972 than did other parole officers.

D. A NOTE ON METHOD: THE USE OF TESTS OF STATISTICAL SIGNIFICANCE

The next two sections of the report present data on the "release conditions" (home, work, home and work, residential, cut-of-state, warrant) and "behavioral release conditions" (alcohol, drugs, counseling, location, reporting, program) placed on state parolees by the Board. These sections also examine how release conditions or behavioral release conditions vary depending upon each of three variables: parole districts released to, race, and institution released from.

The accompanying text discusses only the "statistically significant" relationships between each of these three variables and either type of condition. The effective meaning of using tests of statistical significance is that we discuss only the real* differences.

The relationships discussed are those that are statistically significant at or beyond the $p < .05$ level. The statistic chi-square has been used, with Yates Correction applied as appropriate. In order to simplify the text, the size of each chi-square and the precise level of statistical significance have not been included. The reader interested in the relative importance of the various statistically significant findings is advised to look at the relative sizes of the percentage differences.

* We thus view Board decisions (on which we have data) regarding 1972 state parolees as a sample of Board decisions on state parolees in general. It is also possible to view these Board decisions as (virtually) a 100% sample of 1972 Board decisions on state parolees, in which case any differences are real. Under this alternative view, chi-square (actually ϕ^2 , which equals X^2/N) is here being used to sort out the major differences from the minor ones.

E. RELEASE CONDITIONS

Data was collected on the type of Parole Board vote. Original vote was coded wherever possible. Release reserve conditions were grouped as follows: work only, home only, both home and work, to residential placement, to out of state program, to warrant, to special services. Data is presented only for the second half of the year. This is because data collection began on May 24 of 1972, and data on release reserve conditions usually could not be collected retroactively.

Table 6 presents the frequency of various release conditions for state parolees during the last half of 1972.

TABLE 6Release Conditions, Last Half of 1972

<u>Condition(s)</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
None	338	(43%)
Some	450	(57%)
Work	102	(13%)
Home	46	(6%)
Home and Work	138	(17%)
Residential	101	(13%)
Out- of-State	24	(3%)
Warrant	38	(5%)
Special Service	0	(0%)
Unknown	<u>1</u>	<u>---</u>
TOTAL	788	(57%)

We see here that the Board required some release condition in 57% of the cases and required a complete program (both home and work, or residential) in 30% of the cases.

In order to ascertain if release conditions were related to area released to, Table 7 compares the release conditions of state parolees released to various parole districts. The proportions of state parolees given various release conditions were virtually identical for males paroled to the Northern districts (10-14), Bridgewater office (10-14) and Worcester office (16-21). The table below therefore combines these three groups, in order to facilitate comparisons with males paroled to the Central-Roxbury districts.

TABLE 7

Release Conditions By Parole Districts Released To, Last Half of 1972

(statistically significant differences indicated by *)

<u>Conditions</u>	<u>Central-- Roxbury (22-31, 1A, 3A)</u>	<u>Other Male (1-9, 10-14, 16-21)</u>	<u>Female (female P.O.'s)</u>	<u>Out-of- State</u>	<u>Unknown</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
None	* 79 (27%)	162 (47%)	17 (47%)	15 (35%)	*65 (97%)	338 (43%)
Some	*217 (73%)	184 (53%)	19 (53%)	28 (65%)	* 2 (3%)	450 (57%)
Work	* 32 (11%)	70 (20%)	* 0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	102 (13%)
Home	15 (5%)	23 (6%)	* 8 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	46 (6%)
Home & Work	70 (24%)	66 (19%)	* 2 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	138 (17%)
Residential	* 83 (28%)	9 (3%)	8 (22%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	101 (13%)
Other	17 (5%)	15 (5%)	1 (3%)	*27 (63%)	2 (3%)	63 (8%)
Unknown	0 -	1 -	0 -	0 -	0 -	1 -
TOTAL	296	346	36	43	67	788

There are two major groups of differences in the release conditions of state parolees released to different districts. First, female parolees more often have a home condition but less often have a work condition, or a home and work condition. Second, when we compare male parolees released to the Central-Roxbury districts with those released to other areas of Massachusetts, we find that parolees to the Boston area received a work condition less often and a residential center condition much more often. The greater availability of residential programs in the Boston area may explain why residential conditions are more common among Boston area parolees. This influence may operate both through Board decisions to give residential conditions to Boston men, and through the decisions of men with residential conditions to move to Boston.

Table 8 compares the release conditions of whites and non-whites.

TABLE 8

Release Conditions By Race, Last Half of 1972

(statistically significant differences indicated by *)

<u>Condition(s)</u>	<u>White</u>		<u>Non-White</u>		<u>Unknown</u>
	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	
*None	220	(46%)	88	(38%)	30
*Some	256	(54%)	144	(62%)	48
Work	60	(13%)	35	(15%)	7
Home	24	(5%)	10	(4%)	12
*Home and Work	72	(15%)	53	(23%)	13
Residential	20	(4%)	3	(1%)	1
Out-of-State	58	(12%)	33	(14%)	10
Warrant	22	(5%)	11	(5%)	5
Unknown	<u>0</u>	-	<u>1</u>	-	<u>0</u>
TOTAL	476		234		78

The release conditions given to whites and non-whites differ in one respect: non-whites more often received a home and work condition.

Table 9 compares the release conditions given to M. C. I. parolees released from various institutions. Framingham parolees more often received a home condition but less often received a work condition, or a home and work condition. Forestry parolees less often received a residential center condition, but correspondingly received a home and work condition more often. Norfolk parolees more often received an out-of-state condition; there were no significant differences in the release conditions given to Walpole parolees. Parolees from Concord and Pre-Release more often

TABLE 9

Release Conditions By Releasing Institution, Last Half of 1972

(statistically significant differences indicated by *)

<u>Condition(s)</u>	<u>Forestry</u>		<u>Malpole</u>		<u>Norfolk</u>		<u>Concord & Pre-Release</u>		<u>Framingham</u>		<u>Other</u>		<u>TOTAL</u>	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	20	(37%)	35	(45%)	61	(40%)	188	(42%)	30	(58%)	4	(57%)	338	(43%)
Some	34	(63%)	43	(55%)	93	(60%)	255	(58%)	21	(42%)	3	(43%)	450	(57%)
Work	6	(11%)	6	(8%)	21	(13%)	* 69	(16%)	* 0	(0%)	0	(0%)	102	(13%)
Home	4	(7%)	3	(4%)	4	(3%)	25	(6%)	* 9	(18%)	1	(14%)	46	(6%)
Home and Work	*17	(32%)	17	(21%)	28	(18%)	75	(17%)	* 1	(2%)	0	(0%)	138	(17%)
Residential	* 2	(4%)	11	(14%)	23	(15%)	54	(12%)	9	(18%)	2	(29%)	101	(13%)
Out-of-State	1	(2%)	0	(0%)	* 9	(6%)	14	(3%)	0	(0%)	0	(0%)	24	(3%)
Warrant	4	(7%)	6	(8%)	8	(5%)	18	(4%)	2	(4%)	0	(0%)	38	(5%)
Unknown	<u>0</u>	-	<u>0</u>	-	<u>0</u>	-	<u>1</u>	-	<u>0</u>	-	<u>0</u>	-	<u>1</u>	-
TOTAL	54		78		154		444		51		7		788	

received a work condition. This greater emphasis on work for Concord men is consistent with previously published research showing the poorer job stability of Concord men and the poorer quality of the jobs they held.*

F. BEHAVIORAL RELEASE CONDITIONS

Behavioral release conditions were voted by the Board at the hearing and provide a flag to the parole officer as to the nature of supervision needed. Thus, while "supervision for liquor" does not necessarily mean that a parolee must be written up for one drink, it does point out that alcohol abuse is a potential problem.

The types of behavioral release conditions are by no means standardized; over 40 specific types of conditions have been coded. Indeed, the wide diversity in the behavioral conditions assigned appears to be a problem in the Parole records system. This system is currently being studied, in order to clarify the conditions for the client and the officer. However, behavioral release conditions can be grouped into the following six categories:

- (1) Alcohol use -- e.g., supervision for liquor, supervision for liquor and mandatory AA, mandatory AA or must continue AA;
- (2) Drug use -- e.g., supervision for drugs, must attend drug or counseling program and supervision for drugs, must attend drug clinic (unspecified), must continue Project Turning Point, must attend specified drug action program;**

* See "Statistical Tables Describing the Characteristics and Recidivism Rates of Men Released During 1966 From M. C. I. Norfolk, M. C. I. Walpole, M. C. I. Concord and the Massachusetts Forestry Camps," by Edward F. Callahan.

** In many cases of drug supervision the name of the exact clinic is unspecified. This may cause problems in the parolee's exact awareness of the conditions of his or her parole.

- (3) Counseling — e.g., mental health treatment, DIM, P. O. and subject to develop counseling program;
- (4) Location — e.g., subject may not visit a particular individual (name specified), may not return to Massachusetts without permission of Parole Board, other conditions relating to where subject may not go or must remain;
- (5) Reporting — e.g., must report to Parole Department or Board or P. O. upon release, to report to employment officer;
- (6) Program — e.g., refer to special services for program, close supervision, mandatory program, report to some specified agency concerning employment.

Table 10 presents the frequency of various behavioral release conditions among 1972 state parolees. Note that 10% of the state parolees had an alcohol condition while 15% had a drug condition.* More persons were paroled with either of these conditions (25%) than with all other conditions combined (19%). This has major implications for parole planning. To mention one implication: alcohol or drug abuse constitutes grounds for revocation, yet the parole officer may not have sufficient access to relevant alternatives to reincarceration.

* This issue of the extent of drug and alcohol problems among parolees has also been addressed in a study conducted in late 1971 by Dr. Julia ("Drugs - Alcohol - Parolees"). Based on a questionnaire filled out by parole officers as to the extent of drug use and alcohol abuse among their caseload, the survey found 14% of the total parole population to be linked with heroin use, 17% with other drugs and 19% with alcohol.

TABLE 10

Behavioral Release Conditions*

<u>Condition</u>		
None	543	(56%)
Some	430	(44%)
Alcohol	98	(10%)
Drugs	150	(15%)
Counseling	41	(4%)
Location	16	(2%)
Reporting	86	(9%)
Program	39	(4%)
Unknown	<u>393</u>	—
TOTAL	1366	

* The reader should refer to Appendix B for a more detailed table listing the frequency of each specific behavioral release condition.

Table 11 compares the behavioral release conditions of state parolees released to various parole districts.

TABLE 11

Behavioral Release Conditions By Parole Districts Released To

(statistically significant differences indicated by *)

	Central- Roxbury (22-31, 1A, 3A)	Northern Districts (1-9)	Bridgewater Office (10-14)	Worcester Office (16-21)	Female P.O.'s (Female P.O.'s)	Out-of- State	Unknown	TOTAL
Line	235 (59%)	101 (55%)	74 (58%)	73 (50%)	34 (62%)	22 (38%)	4 (57%)	513 (56%)
Fire	160 (41%)	85 (45%)	53 (42%)	72 (50%)	21 (38%)	36 (62%)	3 (43%)	430 (44%)
Alcohol	* 30 (8%)	* 28 (15%)	14 (11%)	19 (13%)	2 (4%)	4 (7%)	1 (14%)	98 (10%)
Drugs	51 (13%)	34 (18%)	21 (17%)	* 38 (26%)	5 (9%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	150 (15%)
Counseling	14 (4%)	10 (5%)	6 (5%)	2 (1%)	* 9 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	41 (4%)
Location	3 (0%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)	3 (2%)	0 (0%)	* 4 (7%)	0 (0%)	16 (2%)
Reporting	34 (9%)	* 8 (4%)	9 (7%)	* 5 (4%)	2 (4%)	* 26 (44%)	2 (29%)	86 (9%)
Program	* 28 (7%)	2 (1%)	0 (0%)	5 (4%)	3 (5%)	* 1 (2%)	0 (0%)	39 (4%)
known	<u>93</u> —	<u>64</u> —	<u>26</u> —	<u>51</u> —	<u>19</u> —	<u>28</u> —	<u>112</u> —	<u>393</u> —
TOTAL	395	250	153	196	74	86	119	1366

An alcohol condition is less common among Central-Roxbury parolees, while a program condition is more common. An alcohol condition is more common among Northern districts parolees, a drug condition is more common among Worcester office parolees, and reporting conditions are less common among parolees to both these areas. There are no significant differences in the behavioral release conditions received by parolees to the Bridgewater office. Female parolees much more often received a counseling condition. Out-of-state parolees much more often received a reporting condition. They also received a location condition more often and a program condition less often.

It is noteworthy that the percentage of state parolees receiving either an alcohol or drug condition varied depending upon parole districts. These percentages were as follows: Worcester office 39% (with either an alcohol or drug condition), Northern districts 33%, Bridgewater office 28%, Central-Roxbury districts 21%, Female parole officers 13%.

Table 12 compares the behavioral release conditions received by whites and non-whites.

TABLE 12

Behavioral Release Conditions By Race

(statistically significant differences indicated by *)

<u>Condition</u>	<u>White</u>	<u>Non-White</u>	<u>Unknown</u>
*None	316 (52%)	177 (63%)	50
*Some	291 (48%)	106 (37%)	33
*Alcohol	84 (14%)	10 (3%)	4
Drugs	100 (16%)	36 (13%)	14
Counseling	29 (5%)	8 (3%)	4
Location	12 (2%)	3 (1%)	1
Reporting	45 (8%)	32 (11%)	9
Program	21 (3%)	17 (6%)	1
Unknown	<u>261</u> —	<u>106</u> —	<u>26</u>
TOTAL	868	389	109

Perhaps the most important finding presented in this table is that there were not any significant racial differences in the proportions of parolees receiving drug conditions. 16% of white parolees and 13% of non-white parolees received a drug condition. In regard to alcohol supervision, however, whites are much more likely to receive an alcohol condition. 14% of whites and only 3% of non-whites received an alcohol condition.

Table 13 compares the behavioral release conditions received by M. C. I. parolees from various institutions. While this breakdown by releasing institution is of general interest, it may have more pointed use for Department of Correction authorities than for Parole.

TABLE 43

Behavioral Release Conditions By Releasing Institution

(statistically significant differences indicated by *)

<u>Condition</u>	<u>Forestry Camps</u>	<u>Walpole</u>	<u>Norfolk</u>	<u>Concord & Pre-Release</u>	<u>Framingham</u>	<u>Other</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
	<u>N</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N</u> <u>%</u>	<u>N</u> <u>%</u>
None	38 (56%)	* 76 (66%)	110 (59%)	* 270 (52%)	33 (62%)	16 (51%)	543 (56%)
Some	30 (44%)	* 39 (34%)	78 (41%)	* 248 (48%)	20 (38%)	15 (49%)	430 (44%)
Alcohol	* 21 (31%)	13 (11%)	21 (11%)	39 (7%)*	* 1 (2%)	3 (10%)	98 (10%)
Drugs	* 3 (4%)	* 9 (8%)	* 7 (4%)	* 119 (23%)	6 (11%)	6 (19%)	150 (15%)
Counseling	0 (0%)	3 (3%)	10 (5%)	19 (4%)	* 9 (17%)	0 (0%)	41 (4%)
Location	* 3 (4%)	0 (0%)	* 9 (5%)	* 4 (1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	16 (2%)
Reporting	2 (3%)	10 (9%)	21 (11%)	49 (10%)	1 (2%)	3 (10%)	86 (9%)
Program	1 (2%)	4 (3%)	10 (5%)	18 (3%)	3 (6%)	3 (10%)	39 (4%)
Unknown	27 —	43 —	83 —	182 —	36 —	22 —	393 —
TOTAL	95	158	271	700	89	53	1366

Men paroled from Walpole less often received a drug condition. Men paroled from Norfolk received a drug condition less often and a location condition more often. Men paroled from Forestry similarly received a drug condition less often and a location condition more often; they also received an alcohol condition much more often. Men paroled from Concord or Pre-Release received alcohol or location conditions less often but drug conditions more often. Thus, drug conditions were more common among parolees from Concord and Pre-Release, while location and alcohol conditions were more common among parolees from the other male institutions.

Women paroled from Framingham received a counseling behavioral condition ~~more~~ often. Shifting from behavioral release conditions back to release conditions (as presented in Table 9 above), women more often received a home release condition but less often received a work condition, or a home and work condition. As compared to male parolees, then, the Board placed more emphasis for women on conditions relating to counseling and home, while it placed less emphasis on conditions relating to work and drinking.

The findings from Table 13 are discussed above in terms of comparisons among the behavioral release conditions of parolees released from various M. C. I.'s. These findings could also be presented in terms of each behavioral release condition and its distribution among M. C. I.'s.

* 1. Drug conditions were more often given to men paroled from Concord or Pre-Release but less often given to men paroled from Forestry, Norfolk or Walpole (essentially, Walpole commitments). 23% of the men paroled from Concord or Pre-Release had drug conditions, while only 5% of the men paroled from Forestry, Norfolk and Walpole had drug conditions. Fully 79%

(119 of 150) of the parolees released with drug conditions were paroled from Concord or Pre-Release. These figures are perhaps the first hard data we have had to back up the idea that drug problems are much more prevalent among the (younger) Concord parolees than among the parolees from the other M. C. I.'s. Further, these figures on the proportions of parolees with a drug behavioral release condition are probably a more accurate estimate than previously published figures of the proportions of M. C. I. inmates/parolees with serious drug problems. Previous figures have not referred to the proportions of such persons with drug problems serious enough to threaten major adjustment problems on the street, but rather to the proportions incarcerated on drug offenses, or who have previously used drugs, or who have previously run into problems with the law, etc., relating to drugs.

Alcohol conditions were much more often given to Forestry parolees, but were less often given to Concord/Pre-Release parolees or to Framingham parolees. More serious drug problems among Concord men appear to be linked to less serious drinking problems. Counseling conditions were more often given to Framingham parolees. This may reflect that women more often receive counseling at the institution and thus are more likely to be required to continue counseling on the street. Location conditions were less likely to be given to men released from Forestry or Norfolk. There were no statistically significant differences among releasing institutions in the proportions of state parolees given reporting or location conditions.

APPENDIX A

First Address on Release

	<u>TOTAL</u>
A. <u>UNKNOWN</u>	236
B. <u>MASS. CITIES & TOWNS</u>	860

	<u>TOTAL</u>
Abington	1
Acton	1
Acushnet	1
Amesbury	1
Amherst	2
Andover	1
Arlington	6
Ashburnham	1
Athol	1
Attleboro	3
Auburn	2
Avon	3
Ayer	2
Bedford	2
Belchertown	1
Bellingham	1
Belmont	2
Beverly	4
Billerica	1
Boston	293
Bourne	1
Braintree	1
Bridgewater	2
Brockton	15
Brookline	2
Burlington	2
Cambridge	22
Carlisle	1
Chelmsford	2
Chelsea	6
Chicopee	4
Dalton	2
Danvers	3
Dartmouth	1
Dedham	3

	<u>TOTAL</u>
Dennis	2
Dracut	1
Dudley	2
Easthampton	1
Essex	1
Everett	9
Fairhaven	4
Fall River	18
Falmouth	4
Fitchburg	7
Framingham	10
Franklin	1
Gardner	5
Grafton	2
Great Barrington	1
Hadley	1
Hamilton	1
Hanson	1
Harwich	3
Haverhill	9
Hingham	1
Holbrook	1
Holden	2
Holyoke	10
Hopkinton	1
Ipswich	1
Kingston	1
Lawrence	19
Leicester	2
Leominster	4
Lowell	12
Ludlow	1
Lynn	17
Lynnfield	2
Malden	12
Manchester	2
Marlborough	2
Marshfield	1
Maynard	1
Medford	10
Medway	1
Methuen	2
Middleton	1
Milford	2
Milton	3

	<u>TOTAL</u>
Nantucket	1
New Bedford	26
New Salem	2
Newburyport	2
Newton	8
No. Attleboro	2
No. Reading	1
Northampton	1
Norwood	2
Oak Bluffs	1
Orange	1
Peabody	3
Pelham	1
Pembroke	1
Plymouth	1
Plympton	1
Provincetown	1
Quincy	7
Randolph	5
Reading	2
Revere	10
Richmond	1
Rockland	2
Salem	5
Salisbury	1
Sandwich	1
Sharon	1
Shelbourne	1
Shrewsbury	3
Somerset	1
Somerville	22
Springfield	55
Stoneham	1
Stoughton	2
Sutton	1
Taunton	4
Tewksbury	1
Tyngsborough	1
Uxbridge	2
Wakefield	2
Walpole	1
Waltham	8
Wareham	1
Watertown	1
Wayland	1

	<u>TOTAL</u>
Webster	1
Wellesley	1
W. Springfield	2
Westborough	1
Westfield	1
Westford	1
Westminster	1
Weymouth	4
Whately	1
Whitman	3
Wilbraham	1
Williamstown	1
Winchester	1
Winthrop	1
Woburn	6
Worcester	41
Wrentham	4

TOTALC. OTHER STATES TOTAL

	71
Connecticut	10
New Hampshire	6
Rhode Island	9
Vermont	1
New Jersey	4
New York	2
Pennsylvania	4
Illinois	1
Indiana	3
Michigan	3
Ohio	2
Wisconsin	1
Florida	2
Maryland	3
North Carolina	1
South Carolina	2
Alabama	1
Kentucky	1
Tennessee	1
Texas	1
Arizona	1
California	3
Outside U. S.	9

D.

Releases to Residential Placements, 1972

<u>Program</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
Brooke House	60
Brooke House THP	14
Boston State Work Crew/CRS	2
Peaceful Movement Committee	7
Worcester Detention Center	1
Halfway House, Friends of Framingham, Dorchester	8
Worcester YMCA	1
Fall River Halfway House, 466 North Main Street	1
Springfield YMCA	1
St. Jude, Jamaica Plain	1
Westboro State Hospital	1
VA Hospital	1
Boston YMCA	6
YMCA Re-entry and Correctional Systems Program	3
Cambridge YMCA	1
Liberty House	1
N.E. Medical Center, Boston	1
Eastern Middlesex Halfway, Malden	1
Anabasis House	2
Project Turnabout, Hingham	4
Third Nail	6
ABCD - Mattapan resident facility	4
Holyoke YMCA	1
Project Cope	1
Spectrum House, Shirley	2

Continued

Concilio Drug Program, Boston	2
Project Survival, Quincy	1
Marathon House	1
Project Concern	1
Boston State Hospital - Drug Unit	1
Fort Devens	1
Pratt Diagnostic Clinic	4
Hope House - Boston	2
Veilomani	1
Worcester State Hospital	1
Long Island Hospital	1
Soldier's Home, Chelsea	1
Salvation Army - Boston, Brockton	3
Pathway Alcoholic Halfway House, Gardner	1
Our Brother's Place	8
Project Overcome	30
Omnibus - Framingham	1
FIRST	2
Fernald	3
Wrentham	3
TOTAL	100

APPENDIX B

Specific Behavioral Release Conditions

All of 1972 Behavioral Release Condition

543	None
98	Alcohol
3	Supervision for liquor and drugs
45	Supervision for liquor
22	Supervision for liquor + mandatory AA
22	Mandatory AA or must continue AA
6	Supervision for liquor + counseling, mandatory family counseling
150	Drugs
2	Supervision for drug dealing, drug traffic
84	Supervision for drugs
1	Must attend (local) hospital drug clinic (unspecified)
4	Should attend (local) project - drug clinic (unspecified)
16	Must attend drug clinic (unspecified); must attend drug program
1	Should attend drug clinic (unspecified)
2	Strict supervision for all drugs and selling
18	Must attend drug or counseling program and supervision for drugs
8	Must attend specified drug action program (supervision not included)
13	Must continue Project Turning Point
1	Institutional drug clearance
41	Counseling
30	Mental health treatment, DLM (e.g. mandatory DLM or mandatory DLM via P.O.)
1	Must attend mental health clinic to be arranged by Bridgewater at local clinic
1	Must adhere to rules and program from Bridgewater
6	P.O. and subject to develop counseling program
2	Mandatory family counseling
1	Assessment to Boston State Hospital (day care Tuesday - Friday)

16	Location
1	May not move from parental home without P.O. permission
12	May not visit an individual (name specified)
2	May not return to Mass. with permission of Parole Board
1	A particular location is out-of-bounds
86	Reporting
3	Report to work at a specified time
3	Report by phone
11	Report to employment officer
63	Must report to Parole department, Board or P.O. upon release
4	Also on probation as SDP; must follow conditions imposed in SDP court order
2	Must notify department or Board 30 days before possible return to Mass.
39	Program
1	Must continue SDG
1	Must continue school program
1	Must continue medical treatment; must attend VA clinic
1	To continue with Mass. Rehab.
3	To report to some specified agency concerning employment (e.g. DES, OIC)
1	Must continue sepcific counseling
5	Close supervision (e.g. weekly in early months)
3	Mandatory program; must have program
23	Refer to special services for program
393	Unknown
1366	TOTAL



Frank A. Hall
Commissioner

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Department of Correction

*Leverett Saltonstall Building, Government Center
100 Cambridge Street, Boston 02202*

October 16, 1973

M E M O

TO: DOC Staff and Relevant Others

FROM: Correction/Parole Information System Staff

RE: Attached Statistical Reports on Persons Paroled from M.C.I.'s during 1972

Over the last few months you have been periodically receiving reports describing residents of MCI's - e.g. the characteristics of the current population and of admissions and releases during 1972.

A good portion of our effort has also been directed toward developing a data base for the Parole Board. The attached three reports are a first fruit of this effort and describe persons released on parole from M.C.I.'s during 1972.

Along with the set of three reports is a four-page summary containing most of the findings in the reports. We would urge you to read this brief summary, then read the reports as appropriate.



Paul A. Chernoff

~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~

Chairman

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Parole Board

Leverett Saltonstall Building, Government Center

100 Cambridge Street, Boston 02202

July 10, 1973

M E M O

TO: Parole Staff

FROM: Parole-Correction Information System Project

RE: Statistical Report Describing 1972 Parolees from Massachusetts
Correctional Institutions

The following three part report presents descriptive and analytical data on last year's state case openings to parole. A short summary is included to briefly present the major findings.

Parole has for many years published some minimal statistics in the Annual Statistical Report issued by the Department of Correction. The following report constitutes the first detailed description of state parolees that we have yet had. County parolees have not yet been included in the data base; they are described in a separate report produced each year which may be obtained from Lois Greenfield.

The Information System Project has established a data base for Parole to answer our own planning needs and to answer questions from the community. There are forty descriptive factors recorded on every new admission to state institutions and fifteen additional factors collected on release to parole. These fifty-five factors together make up the data base on state parolees. This data base enabled the production of these general information reports. It is also designed as a resource to answer your specific questions about state parolees as they come up.

The Project's response to Parole needs has been developed through Dr. Gwen Julia. We are also, however, dependent upon your comments, suggestions and questions regarding this material. We'd like to thank the Parole clerical staff for their cooperation; their patience in supplying our data needs is most appreciated.

Marian Hyler
Parole Project Staff Member

SUMMARY OF THREE-PART STATISTICAL REPORT DESCRIBING 1972 PAROLEES
FROM MASSACHUSETTS CORRECTIONAL INSTITUTIONS

PART I: "PAROLE MANAGEMENT DATA"

This report contains basic data on numbers of parolees, which MCI released from, which parole districts released to, release conditions and behavioral release conditions. In great detail the report examines the relation of release conditions and behavioral release conditions to other variables -- institution released from, parole districts released to, and race.

The major findings of this report are summarized below:

1. 1366 persons were paroled during 1972 from M.C.I.'s. This is a 34% increase over the 1020 state parolees during 1971. This 1971 figure of 1020 is in turn a 32% increase over the 773 state parolees during 1970. From 1967 to 1970 the number of state parolees held stable at between 750 and 782.
2. 52% of the state parolees were released from Concord. The following percentage of state parolees were released from other MCI's: Norfolk 20%, Walpole 12%, Forestry 7%, Framingham 7%, other 1%.
3. The following percentages of 1972 state parolees were released to various parole districts: Central Roxbury (22-31, 1A, 3A) = 39%. North of Boston (1-9) = 20%. Bridgewater Office (10-14) = 12%. Worcester Office (16-21) = 16%. Female = 6%. Out-of-state = 7%. Finally, of all MCI parolees, 15% were released to residential centers.
4. The following percentages of 1972 state parolees were released to various parole districts within Boston: Roxbury-South End (26-30) = 12% (of all MCI parolees). Dorchester - W. Roxbury-Jamaica Plain (24, 25, 31) = 9%. West End - N. End - S. Boston (22, 23) = 4%. Special Services and Overcome = 14%.
5. 57% of the state parolees were given reserve conditions. The following percentages were given particular reserve conditions: Work 13%, home 6%, home and work 17%, residential center 13%, out-of-state 3%, and warrant 5%.

6. The reserve conditions received by those released to various parole districts were compared. There were no differences among the reserve conditions given parolees to Northern Districts (10-14), Bridgewater Office, and Worcester Office. Females more often had a home condition, but less often had a work condition or a home and work condition. Parolees to the Boston area were given a work condition less often and a residential center condition more often.
7. There were no differences between the reserve conditions received by whites and non-whites, except that non-whites more often received a home and work condition.
8. When we compare reserve conditions by releasing institutions, there was more emphasis placed on work for Concord men, on home for women, and on home and work (but correspondingly less emphasis on residential center) for Forestry men.
9. 44% of the state parolees were given "behavioral release conditions." The following percentages were given particular behavioral release conditions: drugs 15%, alcohol 10%, reporting 9%, counseling 4%, program 4%, location 2%.
10. The behavioral release conditions received by those released to various parole districts were compared. Alcohol conditions were more common in Northern Districts (1-9) and less common for Boston parolees. Drug conditions were more common for Worcester Office. Counseling conditions were more common for female parolees.
11. There were no differences between the behavioral release conditions received by whites and non-whites, except that whites more often received alcohol conditions.
12. When we compare behavioral release conditions by releasing institutions, the major differences are in alcohol and drug conditions. Drug conditions were more common for Concord men but less common for Walpole, Norfolk and Forestry men. Alcohol conditions were less common for Concord men as well as for women, but more common for Forestry men.

PART II: TIME - RELEASED VARIABLES

This report is directed toward these questions: How long are parolees incarcerated before release? How long do they have to serve on parole until discharge? How old are they at release? How many of them are held over beyond their reserve dates?

Since this data is basically numerical, it is summarized in the table on the following page:

<u>Parolees From</u>	<u>Typical* Length of Time:</u>			<u>Age At Release</u>	<u>Percentage Held Over Beyond Release Date</u>
	<u>Incarcerated, For 1st Paroles</u>	<u>Incarcerated, for PV's Being Reparoled</u>	<u>To Serve on Parole</u>		
Walpole	36 mos.	6 mos.	4.6 yrs.	31	18%
Norfolk	27	10	5.6	30	11%
Forestry	21	11	5.3	29	9%
Concord & Pre-Rel.	10	5	4.0	22	17%
Framingham	9	7	4.1	24	8%
Other	<u>19</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>4.0</u>	<u>24</u>	<u>8%</u>
TOTAL	14	7	4.2	25	15

* "Typical" refers to median

Greater attention is given to the topic of parolees held over beyond their earliest release date. As presented in the table above, this is broken down by releasing institution, with the problem most serious at Concord. It is also broken down by the type of reserve condition given. The likelihood of being held over is not particularly related to the type of reserve condition. However, 6% of the state parolees with unconditional release dates spent one or more days incarcerated beyond their parole date.

PART III: BACKGROUND CHARACTERISTICS AND CRIMINAL HISTORY

1. Age at Commitment.

Average is 25. 27% were 20 or below. 20% were 30 or above.

2. Race

69% white. 31% black.

3. Education.

6% completed 5 or fewer grades, 32% completed 6-8 grades, 45% completed 9-11 grades, and 17% completed high school or beyond.

4. Occupation

73% unskilled, 19% semi-skilled, 8% skilled.

5. Marital Status.

25% married, 58% single, 11% divorced, 5% separated, 1% widowed.

6. Military Service.

38% have been in the military.

7. Prior Incarcerations.

21% had prior juvenile incarcerations. 43% had prior House of Correction incarcerations. 33% had prior state or federal incarcerations. 61% had some type of prior incarceration.

8. Present Offense.

45% committed on person offenses, 8% on sex offenses, 29% on property offenses, 15% on narcotic offenses, and 3% on other offenses.

9. Minimum Sentence.

55% received indefinite sentences. 30% received Walpole sentences with minimums from $2\frac{1}{2}$ to 5 years, and 15% received Walpole sentences with minimums greater than 5 years.

10. Committing Court.

32% from Suffolk Superior. 44% from five other superior courts (Hampden, Middlesex, Essex, Worcester, Bristol). 14% from district or municipal courts.